#### REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

# Pursuant to P.A. 124 of 2007 Section 611 Community Re-Entry Program

Section 611 of P.A. 124 of 2007 requires that the Department of Corrections provide individual reports for the community re-entry program, the electronic tether program, and the special alternative to incarceration program, including information on:

- Monthly new participants. Community re-entry program participants shall by categorized by reason for placement. For technical rule violators, the report shall sort offenders by length of time since release from prison, by the most recent violation, and by number of violations occurring since release from prison.
- Monthly participant unsuccessful terminations, including cause.
- Number of successful terminations.
- End month population by facility/program.
- Average length of placement.
- Return to prison statistics.
- Description of each program location or locations, capacity, and staffing.
- Sentencing guideline scores and actual sentence statistics for participants, if applicable.
- Comparison with prior year statistics.
- Analysis of the impact on prison admissions and jail utilization and the cost effectiveness of the program.

## **Community Re-Entry Programs**

This report will focus on Community Re-Entry Programs which are made up of the Community Residential Programs (CRP) for prisoners, Residential Re-Entry Programs (RRP) for parolees, and Technical Rule Violator Centers (TRV) for parolees. Prisoners on electronic tether / monitoring, considered part of the CRP, are not included in this report as they are the subject of a separate electronic tether / monitoring report.

The CRP is a well-established Department program that has changed with the times. In its prime, circa 1992, nearly 3,500 low-risk prisoners were getting re-established in the community while serving the last months of their sentences before parole. Many resided in over a dozen corrections centers and others, when not working or in treatment programs, were restricted to their homes on electronic monitoring. By 2007, due to the continuing impact of the Truth-in-Sentencing (TIS) law's prohibition on housing State prisoners anywhere other than in secure institutions and camps until their full minimum sentences are served, there remained only one correction center, namely the Grand Rapids Corrections Center (GRCC).

The intent of the RRP is to enhance public safety and parolee success through assistance in their transition back to their communities. Comprehensive and structured programming includes facilitated groups that address issues of Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse, Parenting, Criminal Thinking, Recreation, Employment Preparation, Finance/Budgeting, Life Skills, Family Reunification, 12 Step programs, and other programs identified to meet their needs. Core re-entry principles provide the foundation for how each facility is operated. In 2006, the former Camp Tuscola (closed in 2005) was reopened as the Tuscola Residential Re-Entry Program (TRRP) to help further the efforts of the Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative (MPRI). The RRP also includes parolees housed at the GRCC.

The TRV program was designed as an intermediate sanction for parolees violating the conditions of their parole. Returning parolees to prison for each technical violation of a parole condition is not feasible nor is it fiscally possible. However, reasonable responses to violation behavior are critical and further the credibility of parole supervision. These responses are graduated and help promote change. The TRV program provides agents with a sanction for repeated or moderate parolee noncompliance, while still reserving limited prison bed space for those offenders that represent a risk to the public. The TRV program exists at the Grand Rapids Technical Rule Violator Center for females and the Lake County Residential Re-Entry Center for males.

Table 1 shows the dwindling number of low-risk prisoners available to utilize the CRP as well as the growing number of parolees available to utilize the two RRP sites. Table 2 shows that absent the TRV program, nearly 2,400 more parolees would have returned to prison as parole technical violators in 2006 and over 1,400 in 2007.

Table 1 - New CRP and RRP Center Participants Monthly By Location

	Grand Rapids Tuscola					y Location		
	CRF		RR	Р	RRP		Tot	al
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	12	8	65	89		27	77	124
Feb	6	3	58	62		28	64	93
Mar	12	8	65	67		47	77	122
Apr	8	10	79	61		49	87	120
May	12	6	91	80		75	103	161
Jun	3	5	106	77		64	109	146
Jul	3	4	72	75		62	75	141
Aug	4	3	108	57		67	112	127
Sep	6	0	86	69		50	92	119
Oct	1	0	102	87		49	103	136
Nov	7	0	69	46		57	76	103
Dec	2	0	62	33		42	64	75
Total	76	47	963	803	•	617	1,039	1,467
Avg	6.3	3.9	80.3	66.9	•	51.4	86.6	122.3

**Table 2 - New TRV Participants Monthly By Location** 

	Grand Rapids		Huron Valley		Lake C	ounty	Tot	al
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	35	20	98		75	106	208	126
Feb	18	20	97		55	103	170	123
Mar	24	26	130		82	90	236	116
Apr	24	19	107		98	140	229	159
May	39	16	121		95	111	255	127
Jun	37	21	115		82	119	234	140
Jul	31	16	99		83	90	213	106
Aug	35	30	49		144	100	228	130
Sep	12	19	39		105	93	156	112
Oct	21	18	3		149	113	173	131
Nov	24	15	8		102	78	134	93
Dec	16	4	0		110	80	126	84
Total	316	224	866 (	Closed	1,180	1,223	2,362	1,447
Avg	26.3	18.7	72.2		122.0	101.9	196.8	120.6

Table 3 presents the distributions of the lengths of time since release from prison for technical rule violators.

Length of Time	2007		
Since Release from Prison	Number	Percent	
0-6 Months	809	55.9%	
7-12 Months	325	22.5%	
13-18 Months	154	10.6%	
19+ Months	159	11.0%	
Total	1,447	100.0%	

Tables 4 and 5 present active sentence information of the prisoners and parolees at the time of their admission to the CRP and RRP. In 2007, the 1,467 new CRP and RRP Center participants had 2,790 active sentences, with similar distributions to 2006 participants.

The details presented in tables 4 through 7 are for individual sentences only since a composite or cumulative minimum term that accounts for consecutive sentences would obscure offense type information.

Table 4 - Minimum Term Groups for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to CRP and RRP Center(s)

Minimum Term	200	ô	200	7
Groups*	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-12 Months	518	24.5%	681	24.4%
13-24 Months	1,055	49.9%	1,322	47.4%
25-36 Months	323	15.3%	434	15.6%
37-60 Months	173	8.2%	227	8.1%
61-120 Months	43	2.0%	109	3.9%
121+ Months	2	0.1%	17	0.6%
Life	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Offenses	2,114	100.0%	2,790	100.0%
* These Minimum Terms repres	ent individual active s	entences and dis	sregard consecutives	

Table 5 - Offense Types for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to CRP and RRP Center(s)

	2006			2007					
Offense			Average			Average			
Туре	Number	Percent	Term*	Number	Percent	Term*			
Nonassaultive	1,445	68.4%	25.9	1,693	60.7%	25.8			
Drug	349	16.5%	23.8	472	16.9%	24.5			
Assaultive	320	15.1%	40.7	625	22.4%	39.0			
Total Offenses	2,114	100.0%	27.8	2,790	100.0%	27.8			
In months, these Average Terms represent individual active sentences and disregard consecutives.									

New Participants to the TRV program come from near failures of the parole population. These parolees have already served their minimum sentence(s) and any continuation(s) the Parole Board deemed necessary to reduce the risk they posed to the public. Tables 6 and 7 present active sentence information of the parole violators at the time of admission to the TRV. In 2007, the 1,447 new TRV participants had 2,962 active sentences with similar distributions to 2006 participants.

Table 6 - Minimum Term Groups for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to TRV

Minimum Term	200	6	2007		
Groups*	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
0-12 Months	1,269	26.1%	713	24.1%	
13-24 Months	2,323	47.8%	1,489	50.3%	
25-36 Months	728	15.0%	472	15.9%	
37-60 Months	383	7.9%	212	7.2%	
61-120 Months	131	2.7%	64	2.2%	
121+ Months	22	0.5%	12	0.4%	
Life		0.0%		0.0%	
Total Offenses	4,856	100.0%	2,962	100.0%	
* These Minimum Terms repres	ent individual activ	e sentences ar	nd disregard cons	ecutives.	

Table 7 - Offense Types for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to TRV

2006					
		Average			Average
Number	Percent	Term*	Number	Percent	Term*
2,987	61.5%	23.3	1,922	64.9%	23.3
929	19.1%	21.9	500	16.9%	20.7
940	19.4%	35.4	540	18.2%	33.2
4,856	100.0%	25.1	2,962	100.0%	24.7
	2,987 929 940	Number         Percent           2,987         61.5%           929         19.1%           940         19.4%	Number         Percent         Term*           2,987         61.5%         23.3           929         19.1%         21.9           940         19.4%         35.4	Number         Percent         Term*         Number           2,987         61.5%         23.3         1,922           929         19.1%         21.9         500           940         19.4%         35.4         540	Number         Percent         Term*         Number         Percent           2,987         61.5%         23.3         1,922         64.9%           929         19.1%         21.9         500         16.9%           940         19.4%         35.4         540         18.2%

Sentencing Guidelines (SGL) information has been captured in OMNI on a statewide basis since October of 2002 thus, 2003 is the first available, full year of the 1999 Legislative Sentencing Guidelines. Unfortunately, roughly 75% of the sentencing dates for the 2006 and 2007 new CRP and RRP Center participants and roughly 80% of the sentencing dates for the 2006 and 2007 new TRV participants are from before 2003 and additional complications, such as, a mix of sentences with and without SGL data, and the change in handling of SGLs with regard to probation violations, make interpreting SGL sentencing characteristics dubious at this time. Regardless, Tables 8 and 9 shows that most of the actual sentences agree with the SGL ranges, though this comparison is meaningless since it represents about one quarter of the sentences for new CRP and RRP Center participants and about one fifth of the sentences for the new TRV participants.

Table 8 - Comparison of Actual Sentence with SGL Range for New CRP and RRP Center Participants

Actual Sentence	2006		20	07
vs. SGL Range	Number Percent		Number	Percent
Below Range	23	4.8%	41	5.3%
Within Range	449	93.2%	707	91.3%
Above Range	10	2.1%	26	3.4%
Total with SGLs	482	22.8%	774	27.7%
Unknown SGLs	1,632	77.2%	2,016	72.3%
Total Offenses	2,114	100.0%	2,790	100.0%

Table 9 - Comparison of Actual Sentence with SGL Range for New TRV Participants

Actual Sentence	2006		2007	
vs. SGL Range	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below Range	56	7.2%	45	6.8%
Within Range	701	89.8%	594	89.9%
Above Range	24	3.1%	22	3.3%
Total with SGLs	781	16.1%	661	22.3%
Unknown SGLs	4,075	83.9%	2,301	77.7%
Total Offenses	4,856	100.0%	2,962	100.0%

Tables 10 and 11 show that in 2007, there were 1,382 successful prisoners and parolees that left the CRP and RRP and 1,473 successful parolees that left the TRV. Reflecting the difference in Center usage by offender type, the 2007 average successful stay for parolees in the RRP Centers was 32.1 days (up from 16.7 days in 2006) while prisoners stayed in the CRP Center for 75.6 days (up from 56.8 days in 2006). New TRV participants are expected to stay in the program for about 70 days with successful participants returning to parole status. The 2007 average successful stay in the TRV was 66.9 days, up slightly from 66.2 days in 2006.

Table 10 - Monthly Successful CRP and RRP Center Terminations by Location

			Rapids		Tusco		<i>J</i>	
	CRF		RR	Р	RRP		Tot	al
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	5	2	57	81		19	62	102
Feb	6	2	42	66		25	48	93
Mar	5	3	68	63		28	73	94
Apr	4	6	76	59		28	80	93
May	7	8	69	76		42	76	126
Jun	2	3	94	78		43	96	124
Jul	4	5	72	75		36	76	116
Aug	3	5	94	62		72	97	139
Sep	4	2	98	62		49	102	113
Oct	3	2	95	84		66	98	152
Nov	2	0	77	74		39	79	113
Dec	4	2	74	47		68	78	117
Total	49	40	916	827		515	965	1,382
Avg	4.1	3.3	76.3	68.9	•	42.9	80.4	115.2

Table 11 - Monthly Successful TRV Terminations by Location

	Grand F	Rapids	Huron \	Valley	Lake County		Total	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	21	19	99		74	104	194	123
Feb	12	18	74		64	101	150	119
Mar	28	17	91		69	81	188	98
Apr	19	23	91		60	137	170	160
May	19	17	120		81	104	220	121
Jun	23	19	104		85	123	212	142
Jul	23	18	93		64	113	180	131
Aug	37	18	121		80	85	238	103
Sep	24	13	92		88	89	204	102
Oct	31	24	59		151	106	241	130
Nov	21	28	46		97	89	164	117
Dec	16	33	0		103	94	119	127
Total	274	247	990 (	Closed	1,016	1,226	2,280	1,473
Avg	22.8	20.6	82.5	•	84.7	102.2	190.0	122.8

Report to the Legislature Community Re-Entry Program Page 6

Unsuccessful CRP and RRP Center terminations occurred in about 4.7% of all terminations for 2007 with parolees failing in an average of 37.2 days (up from 21.6 days in 2006) and prisoners also failing in an average of 37.2 days (down from 49.5 days in 2006). Unsuccessful TRV terminations occurred in about 3.9% of all terminations for 2007 and tended to occur in an average of 27.8 days (up slightly from 25.7 days in 2006). Typical reasons for the monthly unsuccessful terminations from the CRP and RRP include:

- Escape violation but returned to Corrections or Re-Entry Center
  Medically / Psychologically unmanageable
  Substance abuse violations (4 is mandatory reclassification)
  Rule violator (non substance abuse)
  Failure to seek and maintain employment
  Failure to meet special conditions placed by CRP examiner, e.g.: driving
  New felony / misdemeanor
  Threatening / assaultive behavior
  Creating a disturbance
  Failure to follow rules of Corrections or Re-Entry Center
  No longer eligible due to change in Judgment of Sentence
  No longer eligible time-wise due to findings during time audit or Continuance placed by Parole Board
  As determined by Central Office or Center Area Manager/Manager

Table 12 - Monthly Unsuccessful CRP and RRP Center Terminations by Location

	Grand Rapids				Tusco	ola	Ť	
	CRI	0	RR	Р	RRF	•	Tot	al
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	2	2	7	0		3	9	5
Feb	2	1	9	0		0	11	1
Mar	8	0	7	0		1	15	1
Apr	9	3	3	0		3	12	6
May	7	2	10	0		9	17	11
Jun	3	3	7	0		12	10	15
Jul	0	0	2	1		7	2	8
Aug	2	2	0	0		5	2	7
Sep	0	0	0	0		7	0	7
Oct	3	1	0	0		3	3	4
Nov	0	0	0	0		1	0	1
Dec	0	0	0	0		2	0	2
Total	36	14	45	1		53	81	68
Avg	3.0	1.2	3.8	0.1		4.4	6.8	5.7

Typical reasons for the monthly unsuccessful terminations from the TRV include:

- Medical issues that prohibit their participation in TRV.
- The offender voluntary terminates their status in the program.
- A new felony warrant or felony/immigration detainer is issued for the offender.
- The offender commits a violation while in TRV (e.g., substance abuse, threatening behavior/assault, excessive misconducts for non-compliance behavior, serious destruction/theft of property, smuggling dangerous contraband into facility).

Table 13 - Monthly Unsuccessful TRV Terminations by Location

	<b>Grand Rapids</b>		Huron '	Valley	Lake C	ounty	Tot	al
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	12	3	16		4	5	32	8
Feb	6	2	10		3	4	19	6
Mar	4	1	12		5	3	21	4
Apr	5	2	13		16	8	34	10
May	4	0	6		7	2	17	2
Jun	8	2	7		8	2	23	4
Jul	2	0	15		7	3	24	3
Aug	0	0	5		9	4	14	4
Sep	3	2	3		10	5	16	7
Oct	1	2	2		7	3	10	5
Nov	2	1	0		3	2	5	3
Dec	2	0	0		7	4	9	4
Total	49	15	89 (	Closed	86	45	224	60
Avg	4.1	1.3	7.4		7.2	3.8	18.7	5.0

The monthly new CRP, RRP, and TRV Center participants, monthly successful and unsuccessful CRP, RRP, and TRV Center termination, and average lengths of stay resulted in the end of month CRP, RRP, and TRV Center populations shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14 - End of Month CRP and RRP Center Populations by Location

	Grand Rapids			Tusco	ola			
	CRP		RRP		RRP		Total	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	21	11	36	46		36	57	93
Feb	18	11	43	42		39	61	92
Mar	18	16	33	46		57	51	119
Apr	13	17	32	48		74	45	139
May	11	13	44	52		95	55	160
Jun	9	12	49	51		104	58	167
Jul	8	11	47	50		123	55	184
Aug	7	7	61	45		113	68	165
Sep	9	5	49	52		107	58	164
Oct	4	2	56	55		86	60	143
Nov	9	2	48	27		103	57	132
Dec	7	0	36	13		74	43	87
Avg	11.2	8.9	44.5	43.9		84.3	55.7	137.1

Table 15 - End of Month TRV Populations by Location

	<b>Grand Rapids</b>		Huron Valley		Lake County		Total	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
Jan	51	40	206		152	238	409	278
Feb	51	40	214		145	236	410	276
Mar	43	47	241		153	242	437	289
Apr	43	41	242		177	237	462	278
May	59	40	232		187	242	478	282
Jun	65	40	237		175	236	477	276
Jul	71	37	228		187	210	486	247
Aug	69	49	152		241	221	462	270
Sep	54	53	103		241	220	398	273
Oct	43	45	42		235	224	320	269
Nov	44	31	1		240	211	285	242
Dec	42	2	0		241	193	283	195
Avg	52.9	38.8	158.2 (	Closed	197.8	225.8	408.9	264.6

Report to the Legislature Community Re-Entry Program Page 8

Return to prison statistics measure a parolee's outcome at the conclusion of a standard follow-up period, however, this is not a relevant measure for prisoners in CRP. Table 16 replicates a portion of the table of recidivism rates reported to the Legislature in response to *Section 409 of 2006 P.A. 331* by using a flat two year follow-up period and found that offenders paroled in 2004 had a Total Failure Rate of 46.3% (Absconds 14.2%, Technical Violators 18.3%, and New Sentence Violators 13.9%). New RRP and TRV Center participants for 2004 are the most recent participants that can have a two year follow-up period, however, they would have paroled from a mixture of years from 2004 and earlier. Thus, new RRP and TRV Center participants for 2004 will have a failure rate that averages recidivism rates for paroles in 2004 and earlier.

Table 16 - (portion of) Two-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2004 by Year

Year	Total	Success	Failure		Technical	New
Paroled	Cases	Total	Total	Absconds	Violators	Sentence
2001	9,591	53.3%	46.7%	11.2%	23.0%	12.6%
2002	10,254	52.7%	47.3%	15.9%	18.1%	13.3%
2003	10,987	53.4%	46.6%	16.7%	16.7%	13.2%
2004	10,818	53.7%	46.3%	14.2%	18.3%	13.9%

See MPRI Quarterly Status Report, Addendum No. 15, Table 1 at

www.michigan.gov/documents/corrections/MPRI\_Quarterly\_Status\_Report\_April\_2007\_2nd\_193517\_7.pdf

TRV impacts jail utilization by minimizing the time an offender would otherwise spend in local jails waiting for return to prison as a parole technical violator. Parolees going to the TRV are picked up and transported to TRV within 5 business days of receiving the referral from the Area Manager. Depending on the availability of beds, the TRVs can also be used to temporarily detain offenders who are pending parole violation instead of being lodged at a local jail (this may occur if no jail beds are available).

TRV impacts prison admissions by diverting eligible parole violators who would otherwise be returned to prison as technical violators. At the end of 2007, the average time before re-parole for a parole technical violator was 16.5 months. The 2007 average successful TRV stay was 66.9 days or 2.2 months which saved an average of 14.3 months per first-time TRV participant. Assuming these measures for 2007 are representative of most years and discounting for repeat TRV stays, 400 TRV beds are housing parolees that, if returned to prison, would be occupying approximately 585 prison beds.

Report to the Legislature Community Re-Entry Program Page 9

The following CRP and RRP Centers were operated during 2006 and 2007:

## **Grand Rapids Corrections Center**

322 Front Street SW Grand Rapids, MI 49504

2006 Staffing		2007 Staffing
3.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 1	3.0
16.0	Corrections Officers - E	16.0
19.0	<b>Total Grand Rapids Corrections Center Staff</b>	19.0

Capacity: 160 beds

Capacity: 160 beds

Capacity: 160 beds

Capacity: 240 beds

(The Grand Rapids Technical Rule Violator Center is at the same location and shares some staff.)

#### **Tuscola Residential Re-Entry Center**

322 Front Street SW Grand Rapids, MI 49504

2006 Staffing	2007 Staffing
Parole Probation Manager 13	1.0
Parole Probation Officers	2.0
Correction Shift Supervisor 1	3.0
Correction Shift Supervisor 2	1.0
Corrections Program Coordinator	2.0
Corrections Officers - E9	24.0
Food Service Leader Prisoner	3.0
Maintenance Mechanic – A	1.0
Secretary 8	1.0
<b>Total Grand Rapids Corrections Center Staff</b>	38.0

The TRV programs operated at the following locations during 2006 and 2007:

## **Grand Rapids Technical Rule Violator Center**

322 Front Street SW
Grand Rapids, MI 49504

2006 Staffing
3.0 Correction Shift Supervisor 1
16.0 Corrections Officers - E
16.0
19.0 Total Grand Rapids TRV Staff

(The Grand Rapids Corrections Center is at the same location and shares some staff.)

#### **Lake County Technical Rule Violator Center**

4153 South M-37 Baldwin, MI 49304

2006 Staffing		2007 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 2	1.0
1.0	Secretary - E8	1.0
1.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 1	1.0
2.0	Parole Probation Officer - E	2.0
1.0	Corrections Transportation Officer - E9	1.0
8.0	Corrections Officers - E9	8.0
14.0	Total Lake County TRV Staff	14.0